

“There are other calcareous concretions that contain no kind of organic nucleus, but are composed of precisely the same materials as those which are found around the bones, and present many of the irregular shapes of the tuberous roots of vegetables; some of them also have the elongated *conical form of slender stalactites*, or clustered icicles—a form not unfrequently produced in beds of loose calcareous sand, by the constant descent of water along the same small cavity or crevice, to which a root or worm hole may have given the first beginning:” p. 383. Mr. DEAN’S collection has many examples of encrusted twigs and roots.

Fig. 19, the specimen which so much puzzled the gentlemen who examined the collection while in Mr. D.’s possession is in fact one of the most curious of the whole, nor is yet certain to what animal it should be assigned. Mr. PEARSON, on seeing it, pointed out its great resemblance to the cervical vertebra of the young camelopardalis, which died in Calcutta, a few years since, and of which he preserved the skeleton. Lieut. BAKER has favored me with a drawing of a similar bone, which he states to belong to a fossil elk in Serjeant DAWK’S collection. (See Pl. XLIV. and the description in page 507.) There are others of much larger dimensions, he says, in the Dadupur museum, the contents of which will form the subject of a plate in the ensuing number of the Journal.

The specimen set down as a small petrified fish, which it much resembles in outward form, is, on making a longitudinal section, found to be formed of oval concentric concretions, similar to those of the country almond; possibly they are the convolutions of some shell, but certainly not a fish.

---

VI.—*On the Fossil Elk of the Himálaya.* By Lieut. W. E. BAKER, *Engineers.*

[In a note to the Editor.]

The fossils represented in the accompanying plate, XLIV., are stated by the natives who collected them to have been found in the Haripur pass of the Sub-Himálayan range. The original specimens are in the possession of Mr. DAWK of the Canal Department.

The fragment of antler (fig. 3,) appears undoubtedly to have belonged to a species of elk, and it is possible, that the two vertebræ (figs. 1 and 2) may have formed a part of the same animal: as they are stated to have been brought from the same locality, and this statement is corroborated by the similarity of colour and general appearance of the fossils. One of the vertebræ (fig. 2) was actually

Fossils from the bed of the Jumna River

